DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 443 UD 016 800

AUTHOR Shore, Marietta S.
TITLE Summer ESL Remediation for Incoming Pupils, 1975 High School Umbrella #2, Title I.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE Jul 75
NOTE 24p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 09-61618 (C)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *English (Second Language); Grade 9; Grade 10; *High School Students; Language Handicaps; Language Skills; *Mathematics Instruction; *Reading Instruction; Reading Skills; Secondary Education; *Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS *New York (New York); Stanford Achievement Tests

ABSTRACT

The Summer Remediation for Incoming Pupils Program was designed to provide remedial instruction in mathematics, reading, or English as a second language (ESL) to selected incoming 9th and 10th grade pupils in New York City. This report describes the program and evaluates its effectiveness for the summer of 1975. A major goal of the program was to bridge the gap from intermediate to high school. Pupils were selected on the basis of their reading and math scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test, or if they were rated as having moderate to severe difficulties on the Oral Language Ability Scale for Rating Pupils' Ability to Speak English. The latter students were placed in the ESL component. A total of 3,610 students participated in the program, and of these, 299 were in the ESL component. For students in the ESL component, the goals were to improve understanding, speaking, reading, and writing of English. Activities provided included structural dialogues, choral repetition, reading selections and responding to questions which assessed comprehension, the writing of letters and vocabulary lists. Findings indicated a statistically significant different from pre- and post testing as measured by the Stanford Achievement Test-Primary II Word Reading, Reading Comprehension, and Listening Comprehension Subtests. The majority of ESL and non ESL students, were oriented to their new high school in a positive way. Despite deficiencies in library and guidance services, the overall program must be judged a success. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED137443

EVALUATION REPORT

Function # 09 - 61618(C)

SUMMER ESL REMEDIATION FOR INCOMING PUPILS - 1975 HIGH SCHOOL UMBRELLA # 2 TITLE I

Evaluation Period
July, 1975

Prepared by

Marietta Saravia Shore

An evaluation of the English as a Second Language and Guidance components of a New York City High School orientation and remediation project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89 10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the month of July, 1975.

UDC 16700

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DR. ANTHONY J. POLEMENI, DIRECTOR

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1.0 Program Description..... 2

2.0 Evaluation Procedures..... 2

2.1 Program Objectives..... 2

2.2 Standardized Testing..... 3

2.3 Discrepancy Analysis..... 3

3.0 Findings - Tables..... 4

3.1 Achievement in Reading and Listening Comprehension 5

3.2 Findings from Questionnaire for Students ..... 5 - 9

3.3 Findings from Teachers Questionnaire..... 10 - 11

3.4 Findings from Observation of Program 12

Discrepancy Evaluation of ESL Component..... 13

Discrepancy Evaluation of Guidance Component 14

4.0 Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations..... 14- 17

5.0 Appendix - MIR Forms

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Results for ESL Component Students of a t-test for correlated means for the significance of the mean difference from pre to posttesting of the Reading Comprehension Subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test. 3

Table 2. Results for ESL Component Students of a t-test for correlated means for the significance of the mean difference from pre to posttest of the Listening Comprehension Subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test. 3

Table 3. Students' Ratings of Summer Remediation Program Courses, by percent, for each high school and total program. 5

Table 4. Percent of Students' Responses to Questionnaire for Students, by high school and total program. 7

SUMMER ESL REMEDIATION FOR INCOMING PUPILS-1975 HIGH SCHOOL UMBRELLA #2

1.0 PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Summer Remediation for Incoming Pupils 1975 High School Umbrella #2 was designed to provide remedial instruction in Mathematics, Reading or English as a Second Language to selected incoming 9th and 10th grade pupils.

Pupils were selected for the program who were two years or more below grade level in reading or math as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test, or who were rated as having moderate to severe difficulty (C-F) on the Oral Language Ability Scale for Rating Pupils' Ability to Speak English. The latter were placed in the ESL component.

The total number of students who participated in the program was 3,610 and of those, 299 were in the ESL component, according to the Program Coordinator. This figure was based on an estimate of 23 ESL students per school in the 13 schools which had an ESL component. Of the total of 187 teachers in the program, 81 taught Reading, 92 taught Math, 13 taught ESL, 1 served as a Librarian, and 90 others taught the third period subjects such as typing and shop. The program staff also included 135 Educational Assistants and 135 Students Aides.

The program orientation sessions for teachers began July 2, 1975 and the program for students began July 7. It was held for twenty days of three 50 minute periods through August 1, 1975.

The program was designed to "bridge the gap in changing schools" from intermediate school to high school as well as "to help overcome learning difficulties". For students in the ESL component, the areas stressed were to be "improved understanding, speaking, reading and writing of English".

The enabling activities to be provided for the ESL students, as described in the proposal, were "students will learn by listening to and emulating good models of speech. They will learn vowel and consonent sounds, basic intonation pattern, rhythm, etc. Vocabulary activities will relate to their classroom, school and family environment. Reading main ideas and applying new vocabulary. Writing activities will consist of writing letters, summaries and new endings to stories".

2.0 EVALUATION PROCEDURES

2.1 PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The PRODUCT OBJECTIVES specified in the modified evaluation design for English as a Second Language students were:
1) To achieve statistically significant growth in reading from pre (7/7) to post (7/29) as measured by the Stanford Achievement Test-Primary II Word Reading and Reading Comprehension Subtests (A&B).

2) To achieve statistically significant growth from pre (7/7) to post (7/29) in ability to communicate in English as measured by the Listening Comprehension subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test-Primary Level II.

The PROCESS OBJECTIVES of the Summer Remediation Program for incoming High School Pupils were:
3) To provide remedial instruction in math, reading and English as a Second Language during 1/2 day sessions for the period of July 7-August 1, 1975.

4) To provide supportive guidance services to help bridge the change from a junior high school to a high school.

5) To provide an orientation to the high school plant, staff, services, regulations and criteria for a high school diploma.

2.2 STANDARDIZED TESTING

Alternate forms of the Stanford Achievement Subtests were administered by the teachers in pre and post testing. While there was some variation, the pretest schedule was: July 7: Math, July 8: Listening comprehension; July 9: Reading subtests. The posttest schedule was: July 29: Listening; July 30: Math, July 31: Reading subtests. All students in the ESL component were tested except for those who were absent or those who entered the program late. The discrepancy between the Program Coordinator's estimate of 299 pupils in the ESL component and the 220 pupils who were tested was accounted for by absence and students who dropped out of the program, according to the Coordinator.

A t-test for correlated means was performed to test the significance of the difference in reading comprehension from pre to post testing and similarly the significance of the difference between pre and post means in listening comprehension.

2.3 DISCREPANCY ANALYSIS

In order to determine the extent to which the program was implemented according to the objectives stated in the proposal, the evaluator visited all the schools to which she had been assigned in the Evaluation Plan, observed the ESL and guidance components and conducted interviews with the on-site Teacher-in-Charge, the Teacher Trainers and Supervisors.

Additionally, the English as a Second Language lesson plans were read, where available, and the outline of the topics to be covered by the Guidance Couselors were reviewed. The Supervisors' reports of class observation of ESL classes were also read.

A content analysis of 126 teachers' reactions and suggestions concerning the organization and implementation of the Program, as recorded on a Teacher's Questionnaire, was performed and is discussed below.

The responses to a Questionnaire for Students developed by the Evaluator to tap attitudes and reactions to the program were also tabulated and students' comments read for a content analysis.

3.0 FINDINGS

Objective # 1 Students will achieve a statistically significant gain in reading from pre to posttesting as measured by the Stanford Achievement Test - Primary II Word Reading and Reading Comprehension subtests.

Table 1. Results for ESL Component Students of a t-test for correlated means for the significance of the mean difference from pre to posttest of the Reading Comprehension subtests of the Stanford Achievement Test.

	N	Mean Difference in months	SEMD	t
Total ESL Group tested	222	2.3	.05	4.579***

*** significance established at the .001 level of confidence

	N	Pre Mean (Yr. Mo.)	Post Mean (Yr. Mo.)	Mean Difference (Yr. Mo.)
Grade 9	144	3.12	3.35	0.23
Grade 10	54	3.17	3.49	0.32

Objective # 2 Students in the ESL Component will achieve statistically significant growth from pre to posttesting in the ability to communicate in English as measured by the Listening comprehension subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test - Primary Level II.

Table 2. Results for ESL Component Students of the t-test for correlated means for the significance of the difference between pre and post means in the Listening Comprehension subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test.

	N	Mean Difference in months	SEMD	t
Total ESL Group	210	4.0	.08	5.156***

*** significance established at the .001 level of confidence

	N	Pre Mean (Yr. Mo.)	Post Mean (Yr. Mo.)	Mean Difference (Yr. Mo.)
Grade 9	136	2.52	2.96	0.44
Grade 10	54	2.56	2.90	0.34

3.1 Achievement in Reading and Listening Comprehension

Although not specifically called for in the evaluation design, the English as a Second Language students' gains as a total (N=222) were (Table 1) as well as gains by grade level (Table 2) were analyzed. The objectives of the summer remediation program: a statistically significant increase in the student's level of reading comprehension and listening comprehension, were met.

According to standardized reading grade equivalent tables, it is expected that students will gain one-tenth of a year in reading for each month they are in school. However, these ESL students surpassed that expectation by gaining an average of two-tenths of a year in reading in one month. When analyzed separately, the 9th graders gained two-tenths of a year while the 10th graders gained three-tenths of a year.

When compared to the reality of the average loss experienced by students during the summer, as reported in David J. Fox, Evaluation of New York City Title I Educational Projects, 1966-67 (Center for Urban Education), these results are even more notable. Fox' study reported that when standardized Reading tests (Metropolitan Achievement Tests) were given in both Spring and Fall, data indicated "an average gain over normal progress of .1 of a year from Fall to Spring followed by an average loss of.7 of a year from Spring to Fall". This loss reflected an actual decline of .4 plus an unrealized gain of .3. Therefore, the average gains reported above of at least .2 of a year in one month are not only statistically significant but educationally significant.

The gains in Listening Comprehension by the ESL students were also significant. As a total group (N=210) the students gained an average of four-tenths of a year in the month. When analyzed separately, ninth graders gained .4 of a year while tenth graders gained .3 of a year.

3.2 Findings from Questionnaire for Students

Objective #3 To provide remedial instruction in Math, Reading and English as a Second Language.

Objective #4 To provide supportive guidance services to help bridge the change from an intermediate school to a high school.

Objective #5 To provide an orientation to the high school plant staff, services, regulations and criteria for a high school diploma.

The "Questionnaire for Students" was designed by the evaluator to tap students attitudes and reactions to the summer program. Responses were tabulated from a sample of 35 students attending each of these 13 high schools, for a total N of 477 students.[1] Questionnaires from these 13 schools were transmitted to the evaluator by the Program Coordinator.

The students were requested to answer the questionnaire in order to strengthen any subsequent summer program. The students were further requested to specify any suggestions for the improvement of the program in an open-ended question discussed below.

[1] Every other student was selected until 35 (in two cases 46) students' questionnaires were randomly selected from each school.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

Table 3. Students' ratings of Summer Remediation Program courses, (E=Excellent, K=O.K., N=Not Very Good) by percent, for each high school and total program.

High School	# 3b Reading			# 3a Math			# 3c ESL			# 3e Third Period Activities			# 3d Guidance		
	E %	K %	N %	E %	K %	N %	E %	K %	N %	E %	K %	N %	E %	K %	N %
School A	55	39	6	56	36	9	40	47	13	28	66	6	51	40	9
School B	51	47	2	42	56	2	30	70		48	40	12	50	45	5
School C	59	38	3	51	43		73	27		50	41	9	53	47	
School D	33	59	8	55	42	3	57	43		50	47	3	43	50	7
School E	49	43	8	40	51	9	20	70	10	27	67	6	45	49	6
School F	43	54	3	41	43	16	36	64		33	48	19	32	60	8
School G	50	44	6	53	47		62	23	15	57	34	9	38	50	12
School H	46	51	3	60	34	6	28	56	16	52	34	14	28	62	10
School I	56	41	3	56	41	3	53	43	4	55	38	7	49	51	
School J	70	30		57	37	6	64	36		53	38	9	53	38	9
School K	44	44	12	43	51	6	19	62	19	47	38	15	37	54	9
School L	41	56	3	29	68	3	53	42	5	59	38	3	34	57	9
School M	62	35	3	41	56	3				62	38		56	44	
TOTAL N	213	189	18	218	211	48	89	96	13	207	171	36	191	212	24
	420			477			198			414			427		
TOTAL %	51%	45%	4%	46%	44%	10%	45%	48%	7%	50%	41%	9%	45%	50%	5%

In the Questionnaire, students were asked to rate each of their summer courses as either "Excellent", "O.K." or "Not Very Good". The specific percent of students rating each response for each school is given in Table 3. Summing over the whole program the majority of students' ratings were positive. From 45% to 50% of the students rated each of the courses and the guidance period as "Excellent"; half of the students rated "Reading" and "Third Period Activity" as "Excellent", while 45-46% gave that rating to "Math", "English as a Second Language" and "Guidance."

The majority of other responses, from 41%--50% of the sample, rated the courses as "O.K." and only from 4% (Reading) to 10% (Math) of the students rated any course as "Not Very Good".

Table 4 presents the students' perceptions of the overall effect of the program as an orientation to high school with the specific percent of students' responses for each of the 13 schools listed separately as well as totaled for the entire sample. (N=477).

In response to the question "How useful was this program in learning about your new school?", two thirds of the total sample of students circled "a lot" and another quarter circled "some". Only 7% circled "not much".

A very similar pattern of positive responses emerged to Question #2, "How useful was the Guidance program in learning about the courses you can take in the Fall?" Overall, two thirds of the sample selected "a lot". another quarter selected "some" and 10% selected "not much".

84% of the overall sample of students responded "yes" to Question #4, "Did you get to know any teacher or guidance person whom you would go to for advice in the Fall?" which is a significant achievement of this orientation program.

90% of the sample of 477 students "would recommend this program to your friends" (Question #5) which, as an overall endorsement, is extremely positive.

In response to Question #6, "Are you looking forward to high school in the Fall?", 75% of the students circled "a lot" 19% "some" and only 6% "not much", which indicates that the majority of students sampled had positive feeling about coming back in the Fall; one of the main objectives of the program was therefore met.

The Questionnaire for Students concluded with one openended question, "If you have any suggestions to improve the program, please write below". Of the 477 Student Questionaires, 157 Questionnaires included suggestions. All were read by the evaluator and a content analysis was performed. The students' recommendations were as follows:

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

Table 4. Percent of students' responses to Questionnaire for Students, by High School

High School	#1 overall orientation			#2 course orientation			#4 person to advise		#5 recommend to friend		#6 looking forward to HS		
	A %	S %	N %	A %	S %	N %	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	A %	S %	N %
School A	77	20	3	71	26	3	89	11	97	3	79	18	3
School B	74	24	2	70	23	7	88	12	93	7	68	27	5
School C	71	26	3	79	15	6	97	3	91	6	80	20	
School D	55	27	18	46	35	19	79	21	97	3	66	28	6
School E	27	58	15	65	23	12	82	18	76	24	66	27	5
School F	66	20	14	60	36	4	81	19	82	17	69	31	
School G	68	26	6	58	29	13	91	9	82	18	65	29	6
School H	58	25	17	27	41	32	51	49	80	20	51	29	20
School I	80	17	3	71	24	5	91	9	97	3	86	3	11
School J	86	14	0	66	29	5	91	9	100		89	11	
School K	76	21	3	71	18	11	86	14	88	12	83	11	6
School L	65	32	3	63	28	9	76	24	88	12	82	15	3
School M	77	14	9	92	18		86	14	94	6	82	12	6
TOTAL N	306	126	33	292	113	47	377	72	403	44	330	84	26
	465			452			449		447		440		
TOTAL %	66%	27%	7%	65%	25%	10%	84%	16%	90%	10%	75%	19%	6%

KEY A = A Lot S = Some N = Not Much

1.0 Academic

1.1 Reading Program

25 students made suggestions concerning the reading program. They can be summarized as requests for quantitatively more and qualitatively more interesting reading materials, including the suggestion that the students be allowed library privileges during the summer program. Eleven students mentioned that they would appreciate being able to borrow books of their choice from the school library. (This suggestion seems most appropriate for a program aiming at strengthening reading skills).

1.2 Math Program

Fewer students (6) requested more challenging math: "include algebra in math" and "math was too easy" and one suggested 2 courses, one more difficult and one less difficult.

1.3 Extend the Day

Thirteen students requested a longer day with more subjects; the most frequently requested extra subject was a second language, Spanish. 10 other students requested courses in addition to those offered, including shop, typing, art and music.

1.4 Credit

Several students requested credit for the summer course.

2.0 Recreational Activities

2.1 Sports 30 students requested more sports activities including more gym (14), swimming, basketball and track, and an after school sports program.

2.2 Trips 19 students requested trips to places of interest.

2.3 Recreational Activities 10 students requested the inclusion of activities such as films and parties which would be fun so they would"not be working all the time".

3.0 Lunch

3.1 20 students requested the inclusion of a free lunch or snack break.

3.2 11 students, primarily in the same school, requested a better lunch.

3.3 In two schools the students requested cold drinking water, wich would be basic for a summer program.

Commendations

10 students used the space for recommendations to say that they thought the program was excellent or was helpful to them.

3.3 Findings from Teachers' Questionnaire

The Teachers Questionnaire was designed as an open-ended evaluation of the organization and implementation of the Summer Remediation Program. Teachers were requested to make suggestions for the improvement of the program and give their personal reactions.

The evaluator received the 126 Teacher Questionnaires in sets; however, the schools from which they came were not indicated. Therefore, the teachers' evaluations and suggestions will be treated for the program as a whole.

A content analysis of the 126 Teachers Questicnnaires was performed and the following teachers' suggestions and reactions were categorized:

1.0 Program Administration

1.1 Materials Distribution: The most frequently cited suggestions concerned the lack of educational materials. 32 teachers mentioned the need for more educational materials; books, workbooks and games for reading and math. Several teachers noted that the problem in their school had been late distribution: "materials weren't available until the second week"; another that "funds for materials came the last day of the program", another "woorkbooks didn't come". Students were unable to see their daily progress"; another "games for math never arived".

Other teachers wrote that there were not enough reading materials for certain levels of difficulty and teachers had to borrow from each other. The suggestion made by most teachers was that there should be a greater range of material in reading and math of varying levels of difficulty to meet the varied needs of the students.

A related topic was mentioned by one teacher who suggested that the library be opened so that the students could utilize it. Three teachers also suggested that students be provided with follow-up material for August, one noting that his students had enjoyed the workbook.

1.2 Extension of Summer Program

Another frequent suggestion, made by 20 teachers, was that the program be extended so that it would last five or six weeks; that 20 half-days was too short a period for maximum effectiveness.

1.3 Time Schedule

10 teachers suggested that four 45 minute periods would be preferred to the three 57 minute periods. They observed that the students became restless and felt the classes were "too long".

1.4 Student Grouping

5 teachers requested that students be grouped homogeneously after testing or be grouped according to grade level.

1.5 Student Recruitment

21 teachers suggested more extensive efforts to recruit students for the Summer Program; by recruiting earlier, through more personal contact and advertising more extensively. One teacher suggested "a greater effort to reach ESL students through letters in Spanish."

One of the teachers indicated an awareness of difficulty of recruitment due to the larger system of funding: "As with any reinbursable program, funding comes too close (or after) program is to begin. This results in feeder schools being apathetic to the program."

1.6 Student Credit

18 teachers suggested that the summer program offer 1/2 credit to students who completed it, as an incentive for recruitment and completion of the program.

1.7 Expansion Program

Five teachers suggested that the program be expanded to include students already attending high school who need remedial work.

1.8 Teacher Orientation

Five teachers suggested a more thorough program orientation, particularly regarding remediation, including diagnosis and determining appropriate material for each student.

1.9 Oversupervision

Three teachers cited the number of visits by supervisors as excessive. One teacher had 10 supervisors' visits in 20 half days; another cited 11 supervisors' visits during the 20 half day program.

1.10 Overtesting

Seven teachers objected to the amount of time devoted to testing (3 subtests were given as a pretest to ESL students and 3 subtests as a posttest, each subtest given a different day). One teacher objected to the use of a standardized test for a program of 20 half-days as an invalid measure.

1.11 Paperwork

6 teachers objected to excessive paperwork.

1.12 Refreshment Break

The second most frequent (25 teachers) suggestion was to include a snack or lunch, cold drink or ice cream break for the students. One of the teachers mentioned that in their school teachers contributed funds to enable students to have a snack. (It should be noted that some schools did include a free lunch for their summer program students, so that this is apparently possible for others).

1.13 Recreation and Field Trips

21 teachers suggested that some recreational activity be included for the students; 6 specified gym or swimming; 9 suggested a weekly field trip; four suggested some type of group recreational activity to promote friendships and group spirit.

1.14 Other suggestions pertained only to some school sites, such as the objection by one of the teachers to the summer program being held in a school where noisy construction was going on throughout the month; several (4) teachers mentioned the negative effect on students of the cutback of teachers after the first week with consequent reshuffling of students; a few teachers requested fans or suggested that the program only be conducted on sites with air-conditioning.

1.15 A few suggestions were directed specifically to the guidance component. It was suggested that group guidance be scheduled as part of the regular program for the class as a whole; that students resented being pulled out from the third period activity.

2.0 Teachers' Overall Reaction to the Program

While teachers made specific suggestions for strengthening the program, the overwhelming reaction to the program was highly positive. 82 of the 126 teachers (65%) who completed the Questionnaire stated a positive reaction: the program was"excellent" (20), "enjoyable" (12) "worthwhile" for the students (29), "successful(14), "relaxed" (6) and had"no discipline problems" (3).

The teachers expressed pleasure in the small class size and in working with a group of students who were motivated to learn and achieve in school.

Findings from Observation of Program by Evaluator

Seven schools were visited by the evaluator and both the Guidance component and all ESL classrooms were observed, usually for the duration of the lesson since there were no more than two ESL teachers in any school. The total number of ESL classes observed was ten (of the 13 in the entire program) and six guidance classes or building tours. The high schools visited were:

1) Benjamin Franklin - Manhattan
2) James Monroe - Bronx
3) Eastern District - Brooklyn
4) George Wingate - Brooklyn
5) Thomas Jefferson - Brooklyn
6) Clara Barton - Brooklyn
7) William Maxwell - Brooklyn

1) STAFF

The Program Coordinator was experienced,well organized, and efficient; requested interim feedback from evaluators and worked effectively with his staff.

ESL ESL Supervisors were most cooperative and all three ESL teacher-trainers observed were very competent, articulate and commited to making an effort to help the teachers. Many of the ESL teachers were experienced, competent and well prepared.

Discrepancy Evaluation of ESL Component

The activities planned in the proposal (see Program Description above) were being carried out in most of the ESL component classrooms visited by the evaluator. Where that was not the case, it was due either to insufficient numbers (5 or 6) of ESL students to make up a class (15) and therefore their inclusion in a larger reading class with non ESL students, or, in one case, an ESL class conducted by a licensed social studies teacher instead of an ESL teacher. This resulted in a class where students were speaking in Spanish with the student aides and not engaging in oral practice in English.

However, in several other ESL classes the students were not participating in activities appropriate to their limited English, that is, they should have been practicing speaking in English but were instead being given material to decode which was incomprehensible to them. For example, in one class, students would read material in English which was much too difficult for them, compile lists of the words they did not understand (lists with 25 words) and ask the student aides who spoke Spanish for a translation of the word in Spanish. This would result in lists of words in English with a parallel word in Spanish.

Perhaps due to the emphasis in the remediation program on reading (all ESL students were required to take the test of reading in English even though some of them were very recently arrived from Latin America and knew no English) a basic principle of ESL teaching was not being implemented in 4 of the 10 classes observed: that students should learn listening and speaking skills prior to reading in English as a Second Language. Many students could not answer simple questions in English and were greatly in need of oral practice in English. In one class, the teacher trainer aided by giving a demonstration lesson of structured oral drills appropriate to the basic level of the students. Listening to the students having difficulty in speaking made it apparent that this practice was vitally necessary. If the teachers had been asked to administer a diagnostic/prescriptive assesment instrument for language proficiencies, this would have enabled them to better know and meet the needs of the ESL students.

However,in every class where the evaluator noted that students were not participating in oral English practice or were reading material too difficult for them, it was found that the Teacher Trainers had identified these as problem areas and had or were attempting to assist the teachers. In one class, this had meant suplying reading material at the appropriate (simpler) level of difficulty. In three other classes, the Teacher Trainer had asked to give demonstration lessons on ESL methodology/or to tape a teacher's lesson and go over it with her in terms of modeling inflections correctly. Therefore, the system of Teacher Trainers assisting on-site was working effectively.

Discrepancy Evaluation of Guidance Component

Most of the Guidance Counselors interviewed and observed on tours of the building or group meetings were committed to and were effectively reaching the students and providing them with information concerning their new school.

Several Guidance Counselors were effectively working with Student Aides, students who were attending the high school. The Student Aides served as peer resources for the incoming students.

The Guidance Supervisor's provision of an outline for topics, which was to be planned and completed by Guidance Counselors, served to ensure that the Guidance Counselors would plan the topics of their 4 weekly group meetings with students over the entire program period.

In addition to small group meeting with students, the Guidance Counselors had time allocated for individual meetings with students who were:

1) referred by teachers who identified a need or problem.
2) self-referred
3) in some schools, scheduled by the Guidance Counselor so that each student would meet the Guidance Counselor individually and discuss interests, needs and goals.

In one school students were given a School Handbook in English and Spanish. This was particularly helpful to ESL new arrivals, and for all incoming students was more effective than distributing separate sheets with the floor plan of the school, requirements for the diploma, staff, etc. which are more easily mislaid than when all information is gathered into an Orientation Handbook.

4.0 SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From observations, interviews and Student and Teacher Evaluations, the Summer Remediation Program as a whole was well run and succesful.

The majority of students and teachers expressed very positive reactions to the program in their Questionnaires and the main objectives of the Summer Remediation Program were achieved. Students were oriented to their new high school in a positive way as expressed by the majority looking forward to returning in the Fall and able to recommend the program to friends. The Guidance program was viewed positively by the majority of students as were the summer courses, according to the Questionnaire for Students.

ESL students made statistically significant gains from pre to post testing in both reading comprehension and listening comprehension, as measured by the Stanford Achievement Test, Primary II.

The only significant problem area identified in the ESL Component classes was that in four of them, students were not participating in activities appropriate to their limited proficiency in understanding and speaking English. That is, they were given reading material which was too difficult and were not being given aural-oral practice in English through structured dialogues or, as suggested in the proposal, "emulating good models of speech."

The following recommendations are offered to the program:

1) The Program Coordinator held a meeting with the evaluators and supervisors on July 16 to obtain feedback, and this kind of interim meeting might be helpful also to teachers. In order that teachers could meet as a group with Teacher Trainers and Supervisors to discuss and attempt to resolve problems that arise in implementing the program, one afternoon might be saved from the 2 days of pre-program orientation and scheduled for a mid-month meeting.

Scheduling a demonstration lesson by a Teacher Trainer might be useful since two teacher trainers were observed meeting with some resistence from teachers to their giving a demonstration lesson in their classroom.

2) Only licensed ESL teachers should be hired for the ESL component, as was suggested in the proposal. While it is better for students to have the same ESL teacher in the Fall as in the Summer, when as ESL teacher is not available from one school for the summer program, it might be better to borrow a licensed ESL teacher from another school than utilize someone without ESL training. In the class observed where a licensed social studies teacher was assigned to teach ESL, the time was not being appropriately spent.

3) A diagnostic test of oral English proficiency would enable the teachers to identify the needs of the students. For some, it is practice in speaking English which needs attention.

While the purpose of administering the reading comprehension and listening comprehension tests, according to the proposal, was diagnostic, none of the teachers of ESL students had used the test results diagnostically. To begin with, the tests were not designed for this use.

Teachers learned from a representative of Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich that while the Stanford Achievement Test was excellent for the students for whom it was developed, it was inapropriate for their ESL students, particularly in view of the short time span of the program (20 half-days of instruction).

Instead of the test of Listening Comprehension or Reading Comprehension a diagnostic test of oral proficiency in English should be given to students so that teachers would be able to identify the areas that need attention, and so that the student's level of oral proficiency in English would be established.

Recommendations by Teachers and Students Supported by the Evaluator

1) Library As one of the objectives for students was to strengthen reading skills, the library should be open during the summer program to enable them to borrow books.

2) Materials A better system of material distribution should be instituted, perhaps including books from other classes in the school to meet the varied needs of the students in each class, since both (32) teachers and a number of students found a lack of materials, particularly for reading, due to funding constraints.[1]

3) Recruitment While some schools made extensive recruitment efforts, others appears not to have done as much. The program should be extensively advertized, including articles in the daily press (both English and Spanish) and radio as well as letters to parents of potential students in English, Spanish and for appropriate schools with Haitian students, in French.

4) Expansion of Program The suggestion made by a teacher to open the program to students already in high school in need of remediation seems an excellent one. The class size was often lower than the maximum of 15. A the end of the first week teachers were asked to leave the program due to lack of students. The evaluator had observed 2 excellent ESL teachers in one school, both of whom were let go due to inadequate numbers of ESL students in their classes. Since there are many students who could benefit from these services, it might be best to limit the program to students most in need of English as a second language in high school.

5) Snack A snack break between second and third period consisting of a drink and fruit, cookies, etc. would be helpful in renewing energy and providing time for students to meet and talk informally. The evaluator cannot recommend luch since she observed most of the lunches being thrown away at one school where students finished lunch in 10 minutes of the allocated 20 minutes.

6) Recreation A culminating group trip or activity which the students could have input in selecting would be useful in building positive identification with the school and strengthening friendships.

7) Guidance A practice observed in one school might profitably be picked up by others. Each student was scheduled to meet individually with the Guidance Counselor to discuss interests and goals and establish contact, rather than wait for students to refer themselves.

Another suggestion, made by a teacher, to schedule the whole class as a group for guidance rather than pull out smaller groups from Third Period Activity, would be useful to consider.

8) Oversupervision On several occassions this evaluator went into a classroom to observe and found either the Supervisor or Teacher-Trainer also observing prior to making suggestions to assist the teacher. There seemed to be excessive observation during the program. As teachers indicated, in one case 10 observers, in another 11 observers visited their class in 20 half-days. One Teacher-in-Charge characterized it as

---

[1] Books were to be available from the regular classrooms. When they were not, the program ordered materials, but only after monies were available, causing delays.

a steady tream of observers. It is recommended that the purpose of each observer be considered in order to limit the observations and if possible, that the Teacher Trainer and Supervisors write up their recommendations to be submmited with the evaluation of student achievement.

If the program administrators assess that the feedback from students and teachers was worthwhile, they might include such instruments as the Questionnaire for Students and the Teacher Evaluation in any subsequent evaluation along with the diagnostic/prescriptive/achievement test.

It is recommended that the program be continued next summer since there is a pressing need for remediation programs and particularly ESL programs, and the summer remediation program achieved its major objectives and was rated very positively by the majority of students whom it was designed to assist.

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Albany, New York 12234

MAILED INFORMATION REPORT FOR CATEGORICALLY AIDED EDUCATION PROJECTS

SECTION III

1974-75 School Year

Due Date: July 15, 1975

SED Project Number | 3 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | | 7 | 5 | | 0 | 0 | 6 | | S | |

BE Function Number (N.Y.C. only) | 0 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 8 |

Project Title Title I High School Summer Remediation Program for Incoming Pupils 1975 Umbrella # 2

School District Name New York City High Schools

School District Address 110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Name and Title of Person Completing this form:

Name Marietta Saravia Shore

Title Director, Bilingual Education Applied Research Unit

Telephone Number 212 (Area Code) 360-5641

Date this form was completed 9 / 3 / 75

SUMMER ESL REMEDIATION FOR INCOMING HIGH SCHOOL PUPILS - 1975 -UMBRELLA # 2

Function No. 0961618

Use Table 28 for norm referenced achievement data not applicable to Table 26. (See "Instructions" Item 5 before completing this table.)

28. Standardized Test Results

In the table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project components/activities in achieving desired objectives. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary. [27]

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form Pre	Form Post	Level Pre	Level Post	Total N 2/	Group ID 3/	Number Tested 4/ N	Number Tested 5/	Pretest Date	Pretest Mean	Pretest SD 6/	Posttest Date	Posttest Mean	Posttest SD 6/	Statistical Data 7/ Test	Statistical Data 8/ Value	Subgroup 9/ Subtest
6 14 15	72 0	SAT74	A	B	II	II	148	9	144	1	7/9	3.12	1.45	7/29	3.35	1.24	Cor. t	4.579	.001 Reading
6 1 41 6	72 0	SAT74	A	B	II	II	54	10	54	1	7/9	3.17	1.63	7/29	3.49	1.50	Cor. t	4.579	.001 Comp.
6 1 41 5	72 0	SAT74	A	B	II	II	148	9	136	1	7/8	2.52	1.66	7/29	2.96	1.64	Cor. t	5.156	.001 Listening
6 1 41 6	72 0	SAT74	A	B	II	II	54	10	54	1	7/8	2.56	1.67	7/29	2.90	1.56	Cor. t	5.156	.001 Comp.

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58; CAT-70, etc.)

2/ Total number of participants in the activity.

3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.

4/ Total number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations.

5/ 1 = grade equivalent; 2 = percentile rank; 3 = z score; 4 = Standard score (publisher's); 5 = stanine; 6 = raw score; 7 = other.

6/ SD = Standard Deviation

7/ Test statistics (e.g., t; F; X^2).

8/ Obtained value

9/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

22

10) Program Coordinator did not have data on the discrepancy between the estimated ESL student population (299) and the actual number tested (222), but attributed the difference to absence and dropouts.

No breakdown by grade was available for estimated number of ESL students.

21

32. Program Abstract: Please provide an abstract of your project, including aspects of the project which account for highly positive results. Provide a summary of the findings in relation to the objectives, as well as a description of the pedagogical methodology employed.

33. Date activities began 7/2/75 (Mo. Day Yr.) Date activities will terminate 8/1/75 (Mo. Day Yr.)

34. Project time span (check one): 1|__| School Year 2|X| Summer 3|__| 12 Mos. 4|__| More than 1 year

35. Project is: 1|X| New 2|__| Resubmitted 3|__| Continuation (Title III only)

A. If project is resubmitted, please indicate number of years operated:

|__| 2 years |__| 4 years

|__| 3 years |__| 5 or more years

ABSTRACT

The Summer ESL Remediation Program for Incoming Pupils 1975 High School Umbrella # 2 was designed to provide remedial instruction in English as a Second Language as well as remedial instruction in math to selected incoming 9th and 10th grade students. Pupils were selected for the program who were rated as having moderate to severe difficulty (C - F) on the Oral Language Ability Scale for Rating Pupils' Ability to Speak English.

The total number of students who participated in the ESL Component was estimated as 299 according to the Program Coordinator. They were taught by 13 teachers in 13 schools, assisted by Student Aides. Program orientation sessions for teachers began July 2, 1975 and the program for students was held from July 7 through August 1 for 20 half day sessions divided into three fifty minute periods.

The goals for students in the ESL Component were "improved understanding, speaking, reading and writing of English". Enabling activities provided were structured dialogues, choral repetition, reading selections and responding to questions which assessed comprehension,and the writing of letters and vocabulary lists.

From observations, interviews and Student Questionnaire responses, the Summer Remediation program as a whole was well run and successful. The majority of students expressed very positive reactions to the program in their Questionnaires and the main objectives of the Summer Remediation Program were achieved. ESL Component students made statistically significant gains from pre to posttesting in both reading comprehension and listening comprehension subtests of the Stanford Achievement Test, Primary II.

The only significant problem area identified was that in four of the ten classes observed, students were not participating in activities appropriate to their limited proficiency in speaking English. That is, they were given material to read which was too difficult and were not being given aural-oral practice in English as a Second Language through structured dialogues or pattern drills as suggested in the proposal. Due to funding constraints there were also gaps in materials appropriate to the proficiency levels of the ESL students.

A recommendation was made to give students a diagnostic test of English speaking proficiencies to enable the teachers to prescribe activities approriate to their needs, which they could not do with the data from the listening comprehension and reading comprehension tests.

Component Code	Activity Code	Objective Code
6 1 4 1 5	7 2 0	8 0 1